

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Implementation Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	County of Orange	Amount Requested	\$2,316,780
------------------	------------------	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title	South Orange County WMA IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,150,340
-----------------------	--	----------------------------	-------------

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Three projects are included in the proposal - (1) South Orange County Water Smart Landscape (WSL) Project, (2) Rockledge Ocean Protection Project, and (3) Shadow Rock Detention Basin Project.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/Total Possible	Criteria	Score/Total Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Economic Analysis – Water Supply Costs and Benefits	12/15
Budget	4/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/15
Schedule	5/5	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction	3/15
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance	4/5	Program Preferences	8/10
Total Score (max. possible = 85)			54

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The following is a review summary of the proposal.

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed, but is not supported by thorough documentation. The proposal focuses on the South Orange County Water Management Authority's vision of watershed efficiency, including addressing water quality impairments, establishing priorities for water resources needs, integrating water resource solutions across traditional disciplinary bounds, and jointly advocating for policies and funding that assist these goals. The introduction includes goals and objectives of the proposal, how it relates to the adopted IRWMP and the Region 9 Basin Plan, a tabulated overview of projects which includes an abstract and project status (pages 18 and 19), and maps showing relative project locations (Figures 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 of work plan). There is a discussion of the synergies and linkages of the projects with respect to the regional watershed goals. The discussion of project tasks provides adequate detail and completeness and is clear that the projects can be implemented. The proposal includes scientific and technical information supporting the feasibility of the projects. Preliminary design drawings consistent with the design tasks of the work plan are submitted for the Shadow Rock project. The proposal states that 90% plans and

specifications are provided for the Rockledge project, however, only the specifications are found in the application. The proposal tasks include work item submittals, listing of permits and status including CEQA compliance, although it is unclear if the Rockledge project includes all necessary permits.

Budget

The Budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have cost information as described in Attachment 4, but the supporting documentation for some of the budget categories are not fully supported or lack detail. Summary and detailed budgets were provided, the budget items appear reasonable, and the breakdown agrees with the work items shown in the work plan and schedule. The detailed costs for all the projects lack specificity and not all rationale for estimated costs were explained. For example, The WSL project estimates per square foot costs for landscape renovation based on a survey of six large landscape firms and the per square foot cost a local City is currently paying for renovating landscape areas within their city, but did not provide documentation to verify.

Schedule

The criterion is fully addressed, and is supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule is consistent with the Work Plan, and it seems reasonable to achieve the tasks outlined in the estimated timeframe. Construction for the projects will start after the award date of June 1, 2011 and before December 1, 2011.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed, but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The projects in the proposal are consistent with the Basin Plan, it appears to be feasible to meet the targets within the life of the projects, and the output indicators effectively track the desired outcomes. The WSL project cites rebate usage as an output indicator, but does not quantify it and does not tie it to the desired outcome. Some of the measurement tools in the Shadow Rock project are vague, and some of the targets are not quantifiable.

Economic Analysis – Water Supply Costs and Benefits

Above average levels of water supply benefits relative to costs can be realized through this proposal, based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. Two projects claim monetized water supply benefits of \$3.876 million (M). Most benefits (\$2.88 M) are provided by the Landscape project with \$0.995 M provided by the Trabuco project. The analysis was well-prepared and organized.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of benefits relative to costs can be realized through this proposal; the quality of the analysis is moderate and supporting documentation is partially substantiated. In particular, all of the quantified water quality benefits are based on avoided beach closure days. About 90 percent of these benefits are based on increased visitation at Doheny State Beach caused by the Water Smart Landscape Project. The analysis assumes that this project will increase visitation by one percent or 18,000 persons annually. Some helpful documentation is provided that suggests this assumption is conservative. However, no rationale is provided to justify that the project would result in reduced beach closure days. Therefore, this claimed benefit is considered to be uncertain. The other two projects in this proposal provide moderate water quality benefits.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction

Only low levels of benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. Only one project, the Shadow Rock Detention Basin project, claims flood damage reduction benefits. The present value of flood damage reduction benefits is \$0.185 M, which is a small fraction of proposal costs.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes projects that implement multiple Program Preferences, and are demonstrated with certainty and thoroughly documents the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented. Although the proposal states the projects address water quality needs of disadvantaged communities, it is a non-critical and indirect benefit. Program Preferences that will be met include: Regional projects or programs, Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region, Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions, Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Effectively integrate water management with land use planning, Drought preparedness, Use and reuse water more efficiently, Climate change response actions, Expand environmental stewardship, and Protect surface water and groundwater quality.